

SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
NONCONFORMIST.

VOL. XXXIV.—NEW SERIES, No. 1428.

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2. 1873.

GRATIS.

AN ECCLESIASTICAL WEDNESDAY.

(By a Spectator in the Reporters' Gallery.)

Wednesday last was the second Ecclesiastical Wednesday of the present session—the first being that on which the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was read a second time. Mr. Disraeli having given notice that he should himself move the rejection of the Burials Bill, ensured of course a full attendance, and implied a great party conflict. This direct interposition of the Opposition leader is a rare, if not unprecedented, event. The right hon. gentleman indeed took an active part in the many severe Wednesday struggles over Church Rates and University Tests, but he has not hitherto put himself at the head of his forces to make a charge, and there was no little curiosity to see him enact the part of a general to defend, not a fortress, but an outwork. One result of his notice of motion was to insure a good audience to Mr. Osborne Morgan when he rose to move the second reading of the Burials Bill, with which his name has for four years been identified.

The task of the hon. member for Denbighshire has been peculiarly trying for a leader. The measure of which he is the pilot has never been wrecked, but always stranded in smooth water. The question has been before Parliament more or less prominently, since 1861, when Sir Morton Peto brought in his first bill. The Burials Bill, in its present form, has been read a second time as early as the third week in the session, but only in one instance has it emerged from the shoals of committee. A small and active minority of High-Churchmen, headed by Mr. Beresford Hope, have ever succeeded, by an abuse of opportunities within their reach, in getting rid of the bill by vexatious amendments, or, as Mr. Morgan phrases it, by "midnight strangulation"—a process much facilitated by recent changes in the sessional orders of the House. But for such tactics the bill would ere this have probably been passed in some shape. So hopeless had become the enterprise, that at the close of last session some 170 members of the Liberal party memorialised the Prime Minister to make the Burials Bill a Government measure. The Cabinet, now reinforced by Lord Selborne as Lord Chancellor, declined to follow this advice, on plea of the pressure of other business, and Mr. Morgan once more took the bill in hand almost as a forlorn hope.

Mr. Disraeli is partial to dramatic effects, and his appearance at the commencement of the sitting with the whole front Opposition bench strewn with over two-hundred petitions ready to be presented against the bill, was of this kind. Indeed the opening scene, when nearly a hundred Conservative members one after the other produced their rolls of petitions, all bearing a strong family likeness, from places known only to local fame, and supposed to indicate the great horror of village tradesmen and labourers that their neighbours should be buried in the parish graveyard with other rites than those provided by the Church of England, might have been effective as a demonstration if it had not been felt to be unreal. It had altogether too strong a clerical flavour. Still the scene must have been watched with complacency by the officials of the Church Defence Institution, whose industry got it up, and have given comfort to the many clergymen in the "Strangers' Gallery," who might naturally have been awaiting, as a fitting sequel, a great triumph in the voting lobby. Not a few people in the Palace of Westminster that day were, it is surmised, anticipating a Tory victory, and even the more initiated hoped to see the Liberal majority reduced to thirty, as the result of Mr. Disraeli's active intervention.

Mr. Osborne Morgan's opening speech was suited to the specialities of the occasion. He made skilful use of the appearance in the field as his antagonist of "so consummate a tactician," and sarcastically

referred to that "keenness of political vision" which enabled Mr. Disraeli to find in this bill "one of those great and burning questions which demand the interposition of a great Parliamentary chief"—an opponent, as he afterwards added, not less formidable because at present

Hush'd in grim repose, he waits his evening prey.

As it is impossible for any one beforehand to divine what particular line Mr. Disraeli will take on any question, Mr. Morgan did not attempt to answer him beforehand. So he contented himself with stating his case with the skill of a practised pleader, and with a general avoidance of its irritating aspects. The plea that the grievance he sought to redress was minute he demolished with official statistics, and one after another the time-honoured bugbears raised on the other side—such as that Dissenters would want to enter the churches if admitted to the churchyards, and would indulge in "political orations" at the side of the grave—were easily disposed of. That the aggravating features of one of his illustrative cases were subsequently disproved, was owing to the incorrectness of the information on which he relied. He showed how one concession after another had been vainly made to the susceptibilities of opponents—he having six times accepted amendments—so that the bill now "literally bristled with safeguards," and that a strong feeling was springing up in the Church of England, as indicated by the letters of the Dean of Westminster and the Rev. Llewellyn Davies, and the action of the Church Association, against the continuance of these graveyard scandals. Mr. Morgan was able to show—though clerical fears of parting with a monopoly refuse to take account of the fact—that in every other country in the world members of different religious sects are permitted to bury their own dead with their own services in the parish burial-ground. Last year there was indeed an exception, but the intolerant enactment of Chili had been repealed, and England now stood alone in its exclusiveness—in uttering that "ecclesiastical *non possumus*," which was as rampant in Canterbury as it was in Rome, and which mistook obstinacy for strength, and clung with desperate tenacity to the poorest rag of its privileges, lest it should be suspected of a just concession." With these well-chosen words Mr. Osborne Morgan concluded an effective speech amid the cordial cheers of the Ministerial benches.*

It was about half-past one when Mr. Disraeli rose at the side of the table to relieve the curiosity of a House now swelling in numbers. Though he spoke with distinctness, his accents were feeble, his delivery hesitating. Never did a champion enter the lists with less of defiance in his mien. That the right hon. gentleman should evade the strong points of his opponents' case, and strike out an independent line of his own, was naturally expected. Some spectators might have thought him artificial, and labouring too obviously with a got-up brief. But they might have been prejudiced. At all events, many hon. members around him, particularly the junior representative of the North-West Riding of Yorkshire, swallowed his paradoxes with evident relish, welcomed his "Seven Privileges" demanded by insatiable Dissenters as their exclusive right, as new revelations of the hankering of Nonconformists for ascendancy, and hailed his brand-new argument for closing against them the parish burial-ground at the expense of the nationality of the Church, as a brilliant discovery. It was quite droll, and almost pitiable, to listen to the applause of delighted Conservatives—on this occasion certainly the "stupid party"—while their leader was enacting the part of the man seated aloft on a signpost and sawing vigorously at the beam which was his sole support. Less enthusiastic admirers were struck with the trans-

* The able and convincing speech of Mr. Morgan will be found *in extenso* in the body of our present number. The abbreviated reports which appeared in the daily papers give a very inadequate idea of its force and completeness.

parent sophistry of his Church-rate argument—for if Church-rates were a parochial tax which the vestry could grant or refuse, what becomes of the vested interest of the Church, on which the right hon. gentleman so strenuously insisted? Mr. Disraeli did his best to give importance to the Church Defence statistics, though it was evidently a trying business to handle them gingerly, and to throw an air of pleasantness around returns which he was too discreet to ask the House to accept. Once clear of this embarrassing pitfall of figures, Mr. Disraeli seemed more at home when he went on to advert to the political situation, and first to eulogise and then to chide his Nonconformist "friends." It happens at times that praise bestowed upon one person is apt to damage another. The Opposition leader is skilled in this art, and his flattering eulogies on this occasion must be interpreted not in their literal meaning, but by the exigencies of his position. "You Nonconformists"—we give the sense of his remarks—"with indomitable resolution and a spirit worthy of your ancestors, brought to a successful close a thirty years' war against Church-rates. You were naturally elated at this triumph, and your active zeal and incomparable organisation mainly returned the large majority arrayed on the other side of the House." It was, in fact, a Dissenters' Parliament—a suggestion which, of course, would be anything but palatable to the occupants of the Treasury Bench, who had an idea that the Government represented the national will. Then came the warning and advice:—"You Nonconformists, well organised as you are, must not presume too far. It is a serious thing to declare war 'against the ecclesiastical institutions of the country.' Times are changed. The constituencies have lately been renovated and enlarged, and they aim at the emancipation of the country from undue sectarian influence. It is more than possible—no taunt is meant—that your supremacy in this House may soon cease. The enfranchised people do not contemplate with your enthusiasm the destruction of the Church, which is 'as a city of refuge from the strife that circulates around them.' Pause and think. Wouldn't it be better, instead of assailing the Church, to find in it a faithful and sound ally in the battle against that unbelief which will degrade the country and destroy its religion?" No one can deny the skill of Mr. Disraeli's final appeal—few also will deny its hollowness. As a plea for the maintenance of a wretched monopoly of the graveyard it was misplaced; as a piece of advice, it was under the circumstances an impertinence. But Mr. Disraeli's followers were charmed with his claptrap peroration, and why should other people criticise?

Troops of members now began to leave the House, and were not stopped by the rising of Mr. Hughes, who is not a powerful, though he is a sensible speaker. "Tom Brown" was pithy and forcible. His opening remark—"That if he were a member of the Liberation Society, he should feel inclined to propose a vote of thanks to the right hon. gentleman who had just sat down"—was a legitimate deduction from the preceding speech, and it would doubtless have been cheered, but for the noise of the retiring members. Mr. Disraeli's "seven privileges" were then examined, but the right hon. gentleman did not wait to hear the whole analysis, but slipped out of the House. Granting all, said Mr. Hughes, what then? Should it not be the highest boast of a clergyman of the Church of England that he was *servus servorum*? Mr. Hughes spoke with unaffected sorrow and pathos of the vanishing prospects of a comprehensive Church. "Many of them had dreamed of a time when the Church should arise again to the great work and position which in theory it still held as the Church of the nation. Believing that this state of things would be the best for all parties, it was with peculiar regret that he witnessed the opposition of the great Conservative party to so small and reasonable a concession to the Dissenters as was asked by this bill." Mr. Hughes is the best representative of Broad Churchism in the House, and it will be matter of regret if, as is probable, he should be absent from the next Parliament.

The brief pause for refreshment that ensued enabled hon. members to discuss the probable issue of the conflict. Clearly it was not very brilliant for the Opposition side, and Mr. Disraeli's speech, if it served his own purpose, had not materially helped the cause of his party, or inspired his friends with enthusiasm. There was not enough of fight in it. Though the attendance in the House was still good, there were probably just then more members in the library, dining, and

smoking-rooms than on the benches on either side of the Speaker.

Nor were their steps hastened by the rising of Mr. Cross, one of the Conservatives representatives of South Lancashire, who has taken an active part in opposing the Burials Bill for years past, and who had clearly prepared for a long speech, and delivered it with the fluency of a keen lawyer. Mr. Cross is fertile in expedients. "He's got another remedy," said a prescient reporter near me, and sure enough in a minute or two it was propounded. It was to provide that the bodies of Nonconformists might be buried in churchyards if it were shown that a religious service had been read over them elsewhere. In regard to other cases he would suggest the immediate introduction of a measure to provide cemeteries all over the country. A languid laugh greeted this astounding concession to the demands of Dissenters, and Mr. Cross at length sat down. A number of members below the gangway now tried to catch the eye of the Speaker, who gave the preference to Mr. Morley. The hon. member for Bristol corrected what he spoke of as the exaggerations in the Tonbridge case in the interests of the clergyman, who happens to be a near neighbour and friend of his own, and his explanations were so uproariously cheered on the other side that the Speaker had to call out "Order." From this and other scandals Mr. Morley drew an argument in favour of the bill. Not much animation was given to the debate by Mr. Scourfield, the Tory member for Pembrokeshire, who had some complicated explanations to give relative to a Welsh burial case, nor by Mr. Cadogan, the member for Cricklade, who, disclaiming all ulterior objects, told the story of a refusal of burial rites for a Nonconformist unbaptized youth, in consequence of which a service was performed in the road, with the coffin placed on two chairs—the deceased being placed by the clergyman in the same category as a suicide! With the succeeding speaker the debate reached its dreariest point. Mr. Heygate's persistent fluency suggested the suspicion—for it was now verging upon half-past four o'clock—that there might be an intention to talk the question out. The hon. member recalled Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's recent declaration that he had hitherto voted for the bill under a misapprehension for what it must lead to, and the Under-Secretary of the Colonies took the reminder to heart, for he did not follow his colleagues into the lobby, and was conveniently absent from the division.

The rising of the Home Secretary was a sure sign that the Prime Minister had abandoned any intention of replying to the sophistry of the Opposition leader. Mr. Bruce spoke with studied moderation, very neatly disposing of arguments on the other side. His reference to Irish experience in the burials question—ranging as it did over many years of political and ecclesiastical excitement—was conclusive, and his reply to the Church Defence statistics convincing. Mr. Bruce effectively turned the tables on Mr. Disraeli. He showed that it was clerical intolerance in times past which had excluded Dissenters from the Church of England—a Church which "would be far more potent in a league with fellow Christians against ignorance and infidelity than by keeping up barriers which excited hostility and distrust, and invested it with an invidious character."

Sir Stafford Northcote rose apparently to remind his insubordinate friends that they must not prevent a division that evening, and to supplement and emphasise his leader's warnings against concession to the avowed enemies of the Church. He did not deny there was a grievance to be redressed, but they must look to see what was behind the bill. Their opponents had proclaimed their views with perfect frankness, and he would be equally frank. "It was clear that Nonconformists desired to attack the citadel of the Church; and therefore members of the Church should refuse to give them admission to the outworks by voting against this bill."

The cries of "Divide, divide," which now arose from a very full House, did not daunt one hon. member on the Opposition side, who rose with a roll in his hand, and announced that he had just come from the country. It was a long time before even experienced reporters could identify Sir Herbert Croft, one of the members for Herefordshire, who for the moment enacted to perfection the part of the late Mr. Drummond, and for a quarter of an hour kept the House in a roar with his real or affected blunders, of the nature of Irish bulls. The shouts of laughter that followed Sir Herbert's last joke about the concoction of the bill in the office of the *Nonconformist* were exchanged for cries of "Divide" as he sat down, and Mr. Osborne Morgan rose. His reply was brief and pointed. When Mr. Newdegate was seen addressing "Mr. Speaker," something like a wail of despair arose. But the House has had abundant experience that the dogged member for North Warwickshire is not thus to be put down, and Mr. Newdegate pursued his course with easy confidence till he was pleased to resume his seat. The bar was now crowded with members impatient for the division, but it was not yet to be. A few more minutes were spent, but by no means wasted, in enabling Mr. Serjeant Sherlock to explain his reasons for supporting the bill. If all the Irish Liberals had been there to follow his example and reciprocate the steady support they have always got from the Nonconformist members, instead of looking after other matters at home, the majority would have been swollen by perhaps thirty votes. Once again the

patience of the House was tried. Colonel Beresford, the member for Southwark, wanted either to explain his views or to talk the bill out. But he did neither. There was, indeed, the spectacle of a member making violent gestures, and the occasional sound of a shrill voice rising over the persistent roar, which ceased in an instant as the gallant gentleman subsided in his seat, and wiped his face after his energetic but abortive effort to gain the ear of the House.

Then followed the usual formula preceding the division. The "Noes" in response to the challenge of Mr. Speaker were far more sonorous of voice than their opponents, but the Speaker decided that the "Ayes had it"; and the "Noes" not agreeing, "Strangers" were ordered to withdraw. Members streamed out—some to the right, some to the left, into the lobbies, till the House was empty, and the four tellers had received the customary instructions. The stream soon began to return, and soon the House was full again. Then the tellers were seen struggling through the crowd to report the result at the table. It was a matter of course that the paper should be handed at the table to Mr. Osborne Morgan, who once again with the other three tellers retreated and advanced abreast. And when the unexpected majority of sixty-three was declared, a very hearty cheer arose from the Ministerial benches. It was felt that the vote had strengthened and given renewed prestige to the Liberal party, somewhat demoralised by the recent defeat.

Mr. Morgan had put down his bill for committee on Friday as a mere form, and Mr. Beresford Hope, its most fanatical opponent, gave notice that he should again move its rejection at that stage. It was thought next to impossible that the question would come on then. But it did so happen that there was a collapse of the amendments on committee of supply of which notice had been given, and that Mr. Morgan's bill was called for unexpectedly, the hon. gentleman arriving a minute too late. His presence, however, would have been of no ultimate advantage; for there were not nearly forty members present at the time, and if Mr. Morgan had moved to go into committee, it would have only been necessary for a Tory member to move that the House be counted. At all events the chances that the bill will ever get through committee are very slender indeed.

PROGRESS OF OPINION ON THE BURIALS BILL.

The debate and division on the second reading of the Burials Bill are not the only recent indications of the growth of public feeling in favour of the change which the bill proposes; the bill having this session received weighty support in quarters in which it has not hitherto excited any manifest interest.

We have already quoted the large-minded letter addressed by the Rev. Llewellyn Davies to the *Guardian*, in which he expressed the opinion that Christianity and policy seemed equally to urge Churchmen "to make the innocent concessions proposed by the bill." For the utterance of such sentiments he has been almost savagely attacked by other correspondents of the *Guardian*, but he has not stood alone. The Rev. P. E. Pratt, rector of Crofton, regards the opposition as "nothing but the blindest infatuation," and adds—

Surely, in its present form, the bill is as wholly unobjectionable as if it had been framed by Churchmen themselves. I for one, would gladly see the principle involved extended further, and made to include the use of the church. Nay more; I think it would be a very great gain to allow the use of the old parish church when not required for the appointed services of the Church, to any regularly constituted congregations of orthodox Dissenters. The parish church had formerly a municipal as well as an ecclesiastical character, and I cannot for a moment suppose that any concessions of this kind could tend to the increase of Dissent amongst us. I believe the effect would be exactly the reverse. It is surely better that churches should be religiously used for the benefit of souls, than that they should be shut up during those hours when one and the same minister and congregation cannot be expected to occupy them.

"Rector," writing to the same journal, defends the bill on four grounds, of which we give two:—

The establishment of Dissenting burial-grounds would do much to consolidate Dissent; for every clergyman of experience knows that the poor especially feel an attachment to the place of worship where their relations are buried. We know how very commonly permission is obtained for a clerical friend to commit the remains of a loved one to the tomb. Natural affection demands such sympathy. Is it not placing the Church in an invidious position that she should be made to say, "No; I will not allow this. You shall have the funeral rites performed by one with whom you are not in communion"?

A fourth writer, the Rev. Brooke Lambert, vicar of Tamworth, says that a fit of despair came over him as he read the hostile comments on Mr. Davies's letter. He himself allows Dissenters to sing at the grave, if they wish it, and adds—

What we have to try and imagine is what we should feel had we been educated in a religion which did not happen to be the religion of the majority, when in the hour in which our feelings are most tender we had to

submit to the ritual of another Church, a ritual which, however beautiful in itself, is not that in which we have been accustomed to express our deepest feelings. He is indignant at the suggestion that Dissenters would misbehave themselves in the churchyards, and says:—

I think, sir, that those who can suppose their brethren would at such a time take the opportunity of insulting others, are themselves guilty of a breach of charity as great as that which they suppose others will commit. Do Nonconformists habitually take the opportunity of insulting us, when they meet us on platforms, or at any common business?

I think that to see the differences which separate us here carried to the grave—to see rival chapels standing side by side in our cemeteries, is about one of the saddest sights which our religious strife produces. If a heathen came to England, he would surely ask whether we believed that there were in the world to come separate places for the followers of different forms of religion.

We need not quote here, but may refer to the fact, that the Rev. Mr. Freemantle wrote to Mr. Osborne Morgan a letter strongly approving of the bill, and that Mr. Morgan said that he had received other letters from clergymen of a like kind.

A letter of "Anglicanus" in the *Times* takes just the ground which Dean Stanley might be expected to take on such a question. We quote the following passages:—

The desire of the Nonconformists to be buried in the churchyard of the National Church appears in itself to be a feeling at once so natural and so commendable as to render it the duty and the policy of the clergy by every possible means to encourage it. It is a feeling based on the principle on which the National Church itself is founded, as intended to comprehend and minister to the wants of the whole English people. The bill is a direct acknowledgment of the national character of the churchyards and of the existing rights of the clergy established in regard to them. It is, moreover, in principle an application to England of the same law which existed in Ireland while the Church of Ireland was in full possession of its former legal privileges, and which prevails in regard to the Established Church of Scotland. . . . This being the case, it would be a matter of much regret if, by any unnecessary rigidity or inadvertence of detail, any pretext should be afforded for the impolitic course (of which various indications have been given) of discouraging this welcome recognition of the national character of the Church, or of creating new boundaries of demarcation by the formation of separate cemeteries in every parish in England. . . . It is surely desirable on a point where so many of its best friends are agreed with those who are often regarded as its assailants, to leave no stone unturned which may tend to a peaceful adjustment of the controversy."

He, however, objects to the clause of the bill which prevents the clergy using any other than the prescribed service—which restriction was put into the bill by the Churchmen. He also thinks that the consent of the incumbent might be asked, as was the case in Ireland under the 5th Geo. iv. c. 5. "But," he concludes—

However this may be, it concerns us all to see that the "country churchyards," which the recollections of twelve centuries have hallowed, and which the noblest poetry in our language has immortalised, should be used as "courts of peace" and not of warfare, and that we should be saved from the calamity of further separating those who, if divided in life, would fain be united in the grave.

The *Times*—which last year was unfriendly—this year supported the bill in a powerful leader, from which we select the following passages:—

If there ever was a question in which the Church of England, as represented by its noisiest advocates, was in a thoroughly false position and the victim of sheer suicidal obstinacy, it is in the matter of Mr. Morgan's Burial Bill, which comes on for second reading to-day. Indeed, it is not easy to conceive how these advocates, and the busy gentlemen who have been agitating every parish in England for the last two months, can really have given one serious thought to the question. Had they employed their reasoning faculties and the simplest powers of observation, not to speak of their Christian charity, or patent facts, they would not have treated this measure as a novelty, or as a gratuitous attack on the rights of the Church and the prerogatives of truth. They would not have put out of sight the existence of a grievance which can neither be denied nor despised. Nor would they have denied that the just claims of Nonconformists and others have been refused too long, and that thereby social and religious scandals have grown into a form which is both grievous and irreparable. They would not have been blind to the fact that in this matter the parish clergyman has quite as great a grievance as the Nonconformists, and that their several grievances are not antagonistic, but one and the same; both of them having the same interest in some change. It requires so little thought to see the case for amendment, in at least the direction of this bill, that we will hardly believe a single clergyman of average sanity and respectable attainments has had to do with the opposition to the bill, except in that purely gregarious capacity in which the wisest and best men sometimes seem to move. It is not so very long since there was a considerable clerical agitation, which really had something to say for itself, though persecution was its object and fanaticism its method. Parochial clergymen were found to complain loudly that they had no choice but to perform the Burial Service, intended for true Christians, over suicides, drunkards, profligates, unbelievers, Dissenters, atheists, and notorious enemies of the Church. There were clergy who even left the Church of England, and joined, as they conceived, some purer communion, on the very ground that the Established Church canonised everybody brought to its churchyards. Now, strange to say, there is put into the mouths of the clergy, at we know not whose prompting, an energetic and uncompromising

missing demand that every corpse whatever brought to the churchyard shall be declared by supreme parochial authority to be that of a saint, of whose eternal happiness there is all reasonable expectation. It is demanded that everybody shall be pronounced to have died in the Lord, and thereby rested from his labours, whatever those labours were. We utterly decline to believe that it is the clergy who make this preposterous and impious demand. That they should submit to the existing state of things, and treat as a saint and a good Churchman everybody of whom the contrary cannot be proved with mathematical certainty, is the sublime of charity. But that they should quarrel, and fight, and clamour, and scream for the right of declaring all people to be one as good as another as soon as the breath is out of their bodies is folly, and nothing else. Nor is there the least pretence for assuming that the question is new or that it will wait, or that the resistance has so far been beneficial or successful. We say it advisedly, that the very ugliest and most foolish thing to be seen in all this country is that which is now to be seen near almost every town, proclaiming its folly from the most conspicuous site in the neighbourhood. It is the hideous spectacle of two mortuary chapels, often vying with one another in mediæval frippery, and declaring to the world how the Christians there hate one another, and how even in death they will be divided. This scandal not to the Gospel only, but to our common humanity, is entirely owing to the denial of such facilities as those Mr. Morgan hopes to give by his bill.

The *Times* proceeds to controvert the statement that there is no grievance, and closes by saying:—

There can be no sense or significance, unless it be the paltry significance of a futile victory over a dead body, in demanding that everybody else shall be buried just as oneself would wish to be. In truth it is to rob a solemn and consoling service of its meaning and reality. Church people have only to put themselves in the place of Dissenters—and as Protestants they are Dissenters from many doctrines and practices of the great Western Church—and they must see that this is a case for reasonable concession. The English penetrate everywhere, and die everywhere. It has occasionally happened that they have been refused burial in the only burial-ground within easy reach. We then hear nothing but surprise and indignation at the barbarous inhumanity of the priest and his benighted flock. Yet what is this but the ordinary case of a Dissenter entitled to Christian burial, whose survivors justly consider that, having lived in continual protest against the Church of England, it is not fit that he should be buried with a service suited only to an attached and thorough membership?

The *Spectator*, which has no love for Nonconformists, and is strongly opposed to disestablishment, had a very forcible article on the correspondence in the *Guardian*. Here is a point well put:—

But it does seem very clear that the sense of a very jealous kind of property in religious rights pervades the whole of the feeling of this question. For example, one opponent of the bill asks indignantly whether Mr. Llewelyn Davies has ever considered that under the bill not only may a Dissenter be invited to bury a Dissenter, but a Dissenter might be invited by a factious Churchman to bury one of his own relations, a sort of demonstration against his incumbent. "Has he (Mr. Davies) ever considered," writes this correspondent, "how a discontented member of a clergyman's own flock may, in a spirit of spite, invite a Dissenting neighbour to inflict upon him this humiliation. Has he for a moment thought how offensive such a proceeding would be to the *Churchmen* of the parish, and how embittered the existing alienation of the two parties would become? It is not easy to see how the slight would be at all greater than if the person in question took his relation to be buried by a Dissenter in the Dissenters' side of the nearest cemetery. The motive would be precisely the same, and unless it be imagined, as we feel no doubt it is imagined, that the clergyman has a sort of natural monopoly in all rites going on within his own burying-ground, we do not see how Mr. Osborne Morgan's bill could add any fresh string to the slight. Nor does the worthy archdeacon who writes the letter seem to see that if it be so very hard upon the clergyman that he should not have an exclusive monopoly in the right to bury the dead of his own Church, there could not be a more explicit confession that the Dissenters are sadly aggrieved, so far as they are excluded from that right, and unquestionably they are so excluded in every town in which they have to ask the clergyman of the parish to read the burial service in his own churchyard over one of the Dissenting minister's flock. If it be such a terrible grievance that a clergyman should be liable to be superseded in the duty of burying one of his own flock, at rare intervals now and then, through the resentment or party spirit of a factious parishioner, what shall we say of the grievance which those Dissenters suffer who never at any time have the right to bury their own dead, who are practically refused that right by the state of the law itself? Of the proposal to allow silent burials the *Spectator* asks:—

But what should we Churchmen say to such a privation? Is it not of the very essence of funeral rites that at the last look of the coffin, at the solemn moment when the anguish of the last leave-taking is felt, there should be words of prayer and religious hope pronounced? Why, you might just as well propose to refuse Dissenters the right of shaking hands at the moment of parting on the ship or in the train, on the plea that it would be quite good enough for them if they got their outward leave-taking done in their own homes, as propose that they should coldly deposit the corpse, without a word of solemn prayer or hope, in the earth, and so leave it. If you reduce human forms to the minimum which reason, apart from feeling, will justify, you really do away with them altogether. If we Churchmen value, as we do, that part of the service conducted at the grave as of the very essence of the Burial Service, why not remember that Dissenters are "of the same flesh and blood," and are not likely to be content with silent individual prayer and the bare act of interment?

The writer also asks whether the threatened scandals occur in cemeteries, and asks if the burial

of the dead is an occasion when people usually make fierce onslaughts on each other.

Our space will not allow us to quote from what has been written in opposition to the bill; though some of the writing is of a kind really calculated to secure for it support. Thus one *Guardian* correspondent suggests that if this bill passes, not only will the Church, but the rectory, be invaded. The *Saturday Review* talks about Jumpers jumping over the tombstones, and describes the bill as "a proposal to turn the churches and churchyards into a sort of lawless no man's land, and to reduce the clergymen of the Church to the position of acolytes and candle-snuffers to every form of religious or irreligious Nonconformity." The Roman Catholic *Tablet* thinks that the true principle is "that every denomination should, if it likes, have a distinct cemetery, or separate part of a cemetery, to itself, with the power of excluding therefrom all those who do not belong to its communion." The *Record* writes—just like the *Record*—viz:—

But we must confess for ourselves that if any just grievance exists in this matter we shall be glad to see it removed. It can only be a small one, or else Mr. Morgan would never have so largely modified his own measure to meet the just objections of Churchmen. If the surviving grievance be small, a small remedy may suffice to meet it, and it is right to do justice in small things as well as in great. It were well that the question were settled once for all.

Yet the drift of the article is hostile to the bill, and the writer now thinks that the Clerical and Lay Union

Went too far in the direction of surrender, although great stress was laid in it upon the rigid safeguards which would be necessary if any alteration of the law took place. We fancy, however, that this paper adopted, however unconsciously, too timid a tone to satisfy the country clergy, chiefly affected by this question.

Lastly, we quote the following from a letter of "Clericus" in the *Echo*, the editor of which says the writer is a benefited clergyman:—

I say boldly that 90 out of every 100 would far rather see the Church quite disestablished and disendowed than such a measure become law. . . . If such a bill were to pass the Lords, I would at once throw my loyalty to the winds, and desire nothing better than that England should become one of the States of the Union.

DIVISION ON THE BURIALS BILL.

The following is a list of the members who voted last Wednesday on the second reading of the above bill:—

MAJORITY.—AYES, 280.

Adair, H. E.	Eykyn, B.	Miall, E.
Adams, W. P.	Fawcett, H.	Milbank, F. A.
Agar-Ellis, Hon. L. G.	Finlay, W.	Miller, J.
Allen, W. S.	FitzGerald, Ld. O. A.	Mitchell, T. A.
Anderson, G.	Fletcher, L.	Monk, C. J.
Anstruther, Sir R.	Fordyce, W. D.	Monsell, Rt. Hon. W.
Antrobus, Sir E.	Forster, C.	Morley, S.
Armistead, G.	Forster, Rt. Hon. W. E.	Morrison, W.
Ayrton, Rt. Hon. A. S.	Fortescue, Hon. D. F.	Mundella, A. J.
Aytoun, R. S.	Fortescue, Hon. D. F.	Muntz, P. H.
Backhouse, E.	Fothergill, R.	Norwood, C. M.
Baines, E.	Fowler, W.	O'Brien, Sir P.
Baker, S. B. W.	Gavin, Major	O'Connor Don, The
Balfour, Sir G.	Gilpin, C.	Ogilvy, Sir J.
Barclay, A. C.	Gladstone, Rt. Hon.	Onslow, G.
Barclay, J. W.	W. E.	O'Reilly-Deane, M.
Bass, A.	Gladstone, W. H.	O'Reilly, M. W.
Bass, M. T.	Glyn, Hon. G.	Osborne, R.
Bassett, F.	Goldsmid, Sir F.	Otway, A. J.
Baxter, Rt. Hon. W. E.	Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J.	Palmer, J. H.
Bazley, Sir T.	Gower, Hon. E. F. L.	Parker, C. S.
Beaumont, H. F.	Graham, W.	Parry, L. Jones
Beaumont, J. W. B.	Grant, Col. Hon. J.	Pease, J. W.
Beaumont, S. A.	Greville, Hon. Capt. Peel, A. W.	
Beaumont, Major F.	Greville-Nugent, Hon. Pelham, Lord	
Biddulph, M. G.		Pender, J.
Blennerhassett, R. P.	Grieve, J. J.	Phillips, R. N.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.	Grosvenor, Hon. N.	Playfair, L.
Bolckow, H. W. F.	Grave, T. F.	Potter, E.
Bonham-Carter, J.	Hadfield, G.	Potter, T. B.
Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P.	Hamilton, Lord C.	Power, J. T.
Bowmont, Marq. of	Hamilton, J. G. C.	Price, W. E.
Bowring, E. A.	Harcourt, W. Vernon	Price, W. P.
Brand, H. R.	Harris, J. D.	Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Brewer, Dr.	Hartington, Marq. of	Rathbone, W.
Bright, Jacob	Headlam, Rt. Hon. T. E.	Redmond, W. A.
Bright, Rt. Hon. John	Henderson, J.	Reed, C.
Brinkman, Captain	Henley, Lord	Richard, H.
Bristowe, S. B.	Henry, M.	Richards, E. M.
Brogden, A.	Herbert, Hon. A. E. W.	Roden, W. S.
Brown, A. H.	Herbert, H. A.	Rothschild, N. M. de
Browne, G. E.	Heron, D. C.	Russell, Lord A.
Bruce, Lord C.	Hibbert, J. T.	Russell, Sir W.
Bruce, Rt. Hon. Ld. E.	Hoare, Sir H. A.	Rylands, P.
Bruce, Rt. Hon. H. A.	Hodgkinson, G.	St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Buckley, N.	Hodgson, K. D.	Samuda, J. D. A.
Buller, Sir E. M.	Holland, S.	Sartoris, E. J.
Bury, Viscount	Holms, J.	Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Cadogan, Hon. F. W.	Horsman, Rt. Hon. E.	Shaw, R.
Callan, P.	Hoskyns, C. W.	Sheridan, H. B.
Campbell-Banner-	Howard, H. C. W. G.	Sherlock, D.
man, H.	Howard, J.	Sheriff, A. C.
Candlish, J.	Hughes, T.	Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Cardwell, Rt. Hon. E.	Hurst, R. H.	Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Carington, Hon. Capt.	Hutt, Sir W.	Smith, J. B.
W.	Illingworth, A.	Smith, E.
Carter, E. M.	James, H.	Staepole, W.
Cartwright, W. O.	Jessel, Sir G.	Stansfield, Rt. Hon. J.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.	Johnston, A.	Stapleton, J.
Chadwick, D.	Johnstone, Sir H.	Stepney, Sir J.
Chambers, Sir T.	Kay-Shuttleworth	Stevenson, J. C.
Childers, Rt. Hon. H.	Kensington, Lord	Stone, W. H.
Cholmeley, Captain	King, Ha. P. J.	Locke, Sir H. K.
Clay, J.	Kinnaird, Hon. A. F.	Strutt, Hon. H.
Clifford, C. C.	Knox, Hon. Col. S.	Stuart, Colonel
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.	Laing, S.	Synan, E. J.
Colebridge, Sir J. D.	Lambert, N. G.	Taylor, P. A.
Colman, J. J.	Lancaster, J.	Tollmache, Hon. F.
Corrigan, Sir D.	Lawrence, Sir J. C.	J.

Cowper, Hon. H. F.	Lawrence, W.	Torrans, W. T. M.C.
Cowper-Temple, Hon. L.	Lea, T.	Torrans, Sir R. B.
W.	Leatham, E. A.	Tracy, Hon. Hanbury
Cranford, E. H. J.	Leeman, G.	Trelawny, Sir J. S.
Crawford, R. W.	Lefevre, G. J. Shaw	Trevelyan, G. O.
Cunliffe, Sir R. A.	Leith, J. E.	Villiers, Rt. Hon. C. P.
Dalglish, R.	Lewis, C. E.	Vivian, H. H.
Dalway, M. R.	Lewis, H.	Vivian, A. P.
Davies, R.	Lewis, J. D.	Walter, J.
Dease, E.	Lloyd, Sir T. D.	Wedderburn, Sir D.
Delahunty, J.	Locke, J.	Weguelin, T. M.
Dent, J. D.	Lowe, Rt. Hon. R.	West, H. W.
Dickinson, S. S.	Lusk, Dr.	Whitman, J.
Dilke, Sir C. W.	Lusk, Alderman	Whitbread, S.
Dillwyn, L. L.	Lyttelton, Hon. G. C.	White, Hon. Col. C.
Dixon, G.	Mackintosh, E. W.	White, J.
Dodds, J.	McArthur, W.	Williams, W.
Dodson, Rt. Hon. J. G.	McClure, T.	Williams, E. W. B.
Downing, M. C.	McCombie, W.	Williamson, Sir H.
Duff, M. E. Grant	McLagan, P.	Wingfield, Sir C.
Duff, R. W.	McLaren, D.	Winterbotham, H. S.
Edwards, H.	McMahon, P.	P.
Egerton, Ad. Hon. F.	Martin, P. W.	Woods, H.
Ellice, E.	Massey, W. N.	Young, A. W.
Enfield, Viscount	Matheson, A.	Tellers.
Erskine, Adml. J. E.	Maxwell, W. H.	Morgan, Osborne
Esmonde, Sir J.	Melly, G.	Fitzmaurice, Ld. E.
Ewing, H. E. Crum-Merry, J.		

MINORITY.—NOES, 217.

Adderley, Sir C.	Foster, W. H.	Newport, Viscount
Akroyd, E.	Fowler, R. N.	Nicholson, W.
Allen, Major	Galway, Viscount	North, Col.
Amphlett, R. P.	Gilpin, Colonel	Northcote, Sir S.
Annesley, Hon. Col. H.	Goldney, G.	Paget, R. H.
Arbuthnot, Maj. G.	Gooch, Sir D.	Pakington, Sir J.
Arkwright, A. P.	Gore, J. R. O.	Palk, Sir L.
Arkwright, R.	Gore, W. R. O.	Parker, Lt. Col. W.
Ashton, R.	Gray, Colonel	Patten, Col. Wilson
Baggallay, Sir R.	Greene, E.	Peck, H. W.
Baggio, Sir W.	Gregory, G. B.	Pell, A.
Bailey, Sir J. B.	Hambro, C.	Pemberton, E. L.
Ball, Rt. Hon. J. T.	Hamilton, Lord C. J.	Phillips, C. P.
Barnett, H.	Hamilton, I. T.	Plunket, Hon. D. R.
Barrington, Visct.	Hamilton, Lord G.	Powell, F. S.
Barttelot, Colonel	Hardy, Rt. Hon. G.	Powell, W.
Bates, E.	Hardy, J.	Rakos, H. C.
Beach, Sir M. H.	Hardy, J. S.	Read, C. S.
Beach, W. W. B.	Hay, Sir J. C. D.	Ridley, M. W.
Beetive, Earl of	Henley, Rt. Hon. J.	Round, J.
Bentick, G. C.	Henry, J. S.	Royston, Viscount
Bentick, G. W. P.	Herbert, Gen. Sir P.	Salt, T.
Beresford, Col. M.	Hermion, E.	Scater-Booth, G.
Bingham, Lord	Hervey, Lt. A. H. C.	Scott, Lt. H. J. M.
Birley, H.	Heygate, W. U.	Scordfield, J. H.
Bourke, Hon. R.	Hick, J.	Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir
Bourne, Colonel	Hill, A. S.	Shirley, S. E.
Bright, R.	Hodgson, W. N.	Simonds, W. B.
Brise, Col. R.	Hogg, J. M.	Smith, A.
Broadley, W. H. H.	Holmesdale, Visct.	Smith, F. C.
Bruden, H.	Holt, J. M.	Smith, R.
Burrell, Sir P.	Hood, Capt. Hon. A.	Smith, W. H.
Buxton, Sir R. J.	Hope, A. J. B.	Smith, S. G.
Cartwright, F.	Hornby, E. K.	Stanhope, W. T. W.
Cawley, C. E.	Hunt, Rt. Hon. G. W.	Stanley, Hon. F.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B.	Jackson, S. W.	Starkie, J. P. C.
Chaplin, H.	Jenkinson, Sir G. S.	Steele, Lee
Charley, W. T.	Jervis, Colonel	Straight, D.
Child, Sir S.	Jones, J.	Sturt, H. G.
Clive, Col. Hon. G.	Kennaway, Sir J. H.	Sturt, Lieut.-Col. N.
Cloves, S. W.	Knightley, Sir R.	Sykes, C.
Cobbett, J. M.	Lacon, Sir E. H. K.	Talbot, J. G.
Cochrane, A. Baillie	Laird, J.	Talbot, Hon. Capt.
Cole, Col. Hon. H. A.	Langton, W. G.	Tipping, W.
Collins, T.	Lalet, W.	Tollmache, W. F.
Corbett, Colonel	Learmonth, A.	Tomlin, G.
Corrance, F. S.	Leigh, W. J.	Torr, J.
Croft, Sir H. G. D.	Leigh, E.	Trevor, Lt. A. H. H.
Crosse, R. A.	Lennox, Lord G. G.	Turner, C.
Cubitt, G.	Lennox, Lord H. G.	Turner, R.
Damer, Opt. Dawson	Leslie, J.	Wallace, Sir R.
Davenport, W. B.	Liddell, Hon. Col. G.	Walpole, Hon. F.
Denison, C. B.	Lindsay, Hon. Col. G.	Walpole, Rt. Hon. S.
Dick, F.	Lindsay, Col. R. L.	Walsh, Hon. A.
Dickson, Maj. A. G.	Lopes, Sir M.	Waterhouse, S.
Dimsdale, R.	Lowther, Hon. W.	Watney, J.
Disraeli, Rt. Hon. B.	Lowther, J.	Welby, W. E.
Dowdeswell, W. E.	Mahon, Viscount	Wells, E.
Duncombe, Hon. Col.	Manners, Lord J.	Wethered, T. O.
Du Pre, C. G.	Manners, Lt. G. J.	Wharton, J. L.
Dyott, Col. R.	March, Earl of	Wheelhouse, W. S.
Eastwick, E. B.	Mellor, T. W.	Williams, Sir F. M.
Egerton, Hon. A. F.	Miles, Hon. G. W.	Willmot, Sir H.
Egerton, Sir P. G.	Mills, Sir C. H.	Wise, H. C.
Egerton, Hon. W.	Mitford, W. T.	Wyndham, Hon. P.
Elliot, G.	Monckton, F.	Wynn, Sir W. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J.	Monckton, Hon. G.	Wynn, C. W. W.
Fellden, H. M.	Montagu, Lord R.	Yarmouth, Earl of
Fielden, J.	Morgan, C. O.	Yorke, J. R.
Fellowes, E.	Morgan, Hon. Maj.	Tellers.
Figgins, J.	Mowbray, J. R.	Dyke, W. H.
Finch, G. H.	Munro, Lord	R. Winn, R.
Floyer, J.	Neville-Grenville, R.	
Forester, General	Newdegate, C. N.	

PAIRS.

FOR.	AGAINST.
Sir W. Lawson.	Sir T. Bateson.
Lord R. Grosvenor.	Lord H. Thynne.
Mr. Hardcastle.	Mr. A. Bathurst.
Mr. Macfie.	Mr. C. Brooks.
Mr. D. Dalrymple.	Colonel Taylor.
Sir W. Tite.	Mr. Sackville.
Sir J. Cowen.	Mr. Lopes.
Mr. Whalley.	Mr. A. Guest.
Mr. Jardine.	Mr. Groves.
Mr. Foljambe.	Mr. Malcolm.
Mr. H. Samuelson.	Sir E. Buckley.
Mr. Seely, jun.	Mr. Holker.
Mr. T. Brassey.	Mr. Barrow.
Mr. C. R. Talbot.	Mr. Butler-Johnstone.
Sir J. Lubbock.	Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Robertson.	Mr. Hutton.
Mr. C. Fitzwilliam.	Mr. Baring.
Baron M. de Rothschild.	Mr. Hildyard.
Mr. A. Seymour.	Mr. Knight.

Dr. Brady, who would have voted for the bill, was unavoidably absent.

Considering that in Scotland and Ireland the law is the same as it would be in England if Mr. Morgan's bill were passed, it is a significant fact that forty-five Scotch members (one of them Colonel Grant, a Conservative), voted for the bill, and not one, either Liberal or Conservative, against it; and that thirty-four Irish members (three of them Conservatives) also voted for it.

Of the Welsh Liberals, nineteen voted for, and two paired for the bill; the Hon. W. O. Stanley and Mr. W. B. Hughes being absent, unpaired.

Four Liberals voted against the bill, viz., Edward Ackroyd (Halifax), W. H. Foster (Bridgmont), William Nicholson (Petersfield), George Tomline (Great Grimsby). Most of these usually vote against religious-equality measures. On the other hand, four Conservatives—none of them English representa-

tive—voted for the bill, viz., Col. James Grant (Elgin), Lord Claud Hamilton (Tyrone), Hon. Col. Knox (Dungannon), and C. E. Lewis (Derry).

The representatives of the several parts of the United Kingdom voted as follows:—

For the Bill.		Against the Bill.	
English	184	English	200
Welsh	19	Welsh	5
Scotch	45	Scotch	14
Irish	34	Irish	14

Including tellers... 282 Including tellers... 219

Of the Roman Catholic members only Lord Robert Montagu voted against the measure. Of the Jews, Sir F. Goldsmid, Baron Nathan de Rothschild, Serjeant Simon, and Sir G. Jessell voted for it, and Baron M. de Rothschild paired for it. Baron Rothschild (London), Sir D. Salomons, and Mr. Julian Goldamid were absent unpaired.

There were absent 140 members. Of those eighty-six were Liberals, but nineteen were paired, leaving sixty-seven unpaired. The Conservative absentees were sixty-three, of whom nineteen were paired, and forty-four unpaired. If therefore every Conservative unpaired absentee had voted against it, the bill would still have been carried, whereas if every unpaired Liberal had voted for it the majority would have been 107. A large number of the absentees were Irish, and were understood to be in Ireland.

In the majority were twenty-six members of the Government. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen did not vote; being hampered by his recent speech at a Church Conference at Canterbury.

In the various divisions which have taken place on the Burials Bill during the present Parliament, the numbers (including tellers) were as follows:—

	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
For.....	235	213	181	282
Against...	124	151	110	219

Majority.. 111 62 71 63

It will be seen that the vote of this session was the largest which has yet been taken on the bill. Notwithstanding that its opponents mustered 109 votes more than last year, the majority was reduced by eight only, the number of supporters having also been increased by 101.

THE IRISH UNIVERSITY BILL AND RELIGIOUS EQUALITY.

Under the auspices of the Finabury branch of the Liberation Society, a lecture on "The Irish University Bill and its Fate—a Lesson in Religious Equality," was delivered at the Holloway Hall, North London, last Wednesday evening, by the Rev. J. A. Picton, M.A. The chair was taken by Mr. John Glover, and amongst those present were Messrs. B. Lucraft, Carvell Williams, R. Forsaith, Philip Crellin, C. H. Elt, Chas. Miall, E. J. Harry, P. Williams, &c., &c.

The CHAIRMAN, in introducing the lecturer, said the subject of Church establishments in England was not a new one, and he did not think it was a topic of which we were likely to be rid within the next few years. Ever since the famous Act of Uniformity, when our Government tried to do what it was impossible for any Government to do, namely, to provide that all worshippers should believe the same doctrines, use the same prayers, belong to the same sect, and attend the same places of worship; ever since then we had seen that it was possible for Acts of Parliament to be passed which never became facts. Ever since that Act was passed it had become apparent that there were persons who, notwithstanding the Act, would say their own prayers, believe in the doctrines which seemed to them to be right, and worship in their own buildings as they thought fit. All that was written on the Statute-book, with the object of securing uniformity, had, we all knew, fallen entirely into disuse; and although through a series of ages measures of toleration had been pursued as the sentiments of the people became more Liberal, enough had not been done to satisfy the requirements of religious equality. The fact was, we were getting tired of Acts of Toleration. We did not want to be tolerated any longer. If there was one thing more than another which the Englishman wanted to get rid of, it was the idea of toleration. All such enactments were the mere consequences of the existence of an Established Church. Now, notwithstanding that Nonconformists were only tolerated, it was by the law alone that they were only tolerated. The public sentiment and the public feeling of the country were far ahead of all that toleration. The public feeling of the country was indeed very nearly right on this subject, and it needed only equality in the eye of the law to complete the religious equality of the people. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. J. A. PICTON, in the course of his lecture, expressed his belief that Ireland, in consequence of her peculiarities had contributed much to the progress of Imperial legislation. There were millions to demand the redress of Irish grievances, and thus concessions were made which obliged concessions at home. Disestablishment had begun in Ireland, and that example would ere long be followed in England. Sooner or later, too, the impossibility of solving the denominational problem in Ireland by any compromise would drive us to the simple and direct solution of the problem in this country, in all our public schools, high and

low. It was because it was a step in this direction that he rejoiced in the defeat even of a Government which he respected in the matter of this Irish University Bill. After briefly reviewing Mr. Gladstone's policy with regard to the first two branches of the "Upas tree"—the Church and the Land—Mr. Picton observed that the disestablishment of the Church was carried by the Liberals of England with the help of the Nonconformists and the Irish Roman Catholics. The English Nonconformists wanted only religious equality; there could be no doubt that the Catholics wanted something more. They wanted to substitute on kind of ascendancy for another, and they had been looking for some mode by which their religion could be endowed. He could not help thinking that the Nonconformists might have marked better than they did this important divergence between the views of the two wings of the party who supported Mr. Gladstone in the policy of 1869. Mr. Picton then described the Irish University Bill and its antecedents, the English and Scotch Education Act. It should be carefully noted that the Elementary Education Acts in operation in England and Scotland permitted the religious opinions of the majority to be taught at the public expense in the public elementary schools. He had no doubt that the Roman Catholics were extremely gratified at that. They were remarkably quiet on that subject. No doubt they expected to get more out of it than had proved possible in England; but they were thinking about the country across the water, thus: "If you apply across the water the principle you have applied here, we shall get all we want." "What is your rule?" they ask, "Why it is this—to meet the religious feeling of the majority of the population; you do that in England, and do not call it sectarian; when you come to our side of the water you will not find the same number of sects, and if you apply your rule consulting the religious feeling of the majority of the population, you must let us have the priests in the schools, and if necessary, the cardinals and the Pope as well." (Applause.) That was the attitude of the Romanists. While things were in this position Mr. Gladstone was pledged to approach the third branch of the "Upas Tree"—religious exclusiveness in Ireland—and he brought in a bill which was in harmony with English and Scotch legislation for education; for there were sectarian colleges to be affiliated to the new university, and benevolent Catholics would have to support these colleges. But what was the Roman Catholic grievance, supposing only the tests were swept away? "Ah!" cried the priests, "there is grievance enough; unless you endow a Roman Catholic university, unless you allow us to confer degrees according to our standards of learning, we consider we are badly treated, and are a persecuted Church; we stand almost alone in Ireland; we demand that you shall endow an institution for us." Well, he (Mr. Picton) did not deny that our educational policy in England had given some ground for that mode of argument. Mr. Gladstone looking at the question from the English standpoint, accustomed to the association of ample privileges, with the imparting of religious instruction according to the views of the majority, thought that the Catholics in Ireland ought to be able to send their children to some institution where they should receive religious instruction on the same authority as the secular instruction. But how was that to be done without an endowment? Catholic endowment was impossible in the present state of public feeling, and he hoped it always would be. (Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. Gladstone had his scheme. An attempt was made in that clever bill to do the same thing indirectly. The lecturer proceeded to describe the plan, which would have given the Roman Catholics a preponderating influence because they were Catholics, and the institution would have been swayed by Roman Catholic feeling; and then, in order to provide for the protection of conscience, moral and mental philosophy, and actually modern history, were to be excluded, and a professor was to be punished by deprivation or otherwise if he was held to have wilfully offended against the conscientious convictions of a student. Here was to be a council elected by the predominating creed who could deprive a professor of his position who should happen to say that modern civilisation was a sacred and righteous thing. In refusing to accept this proposal the priests had, he thought, thrown away a chance which would never be proffered again. (Hear, hear.) For himself, he would have preferred Mr. Fawcett's bill, for it simply threw away the tests, and left other things in connection with Irish University education to be improved gradually. Relative to the demands of the Roman Catholics, who upheld a sort of spiritual despotism which Nonconformists regarded as one of the most fatal and blighting influences that ever spread over the world, the lecturer said they would have to make a very firm stand. They had been so accustomed to compromise that it would be a long time before the Catholics would believe that they were going to be firm. When the time came that they asked nothing for themselves they were not willing to give to the Catholics, their course would be clear. At present there were many difficulties in the way. One great difficulty was the question of the Established Church in this country. So long as the Roman Catholics could point to this Establishment and say "See what you can do where the Protestants are in a majority; but the Episcopalians are not in such a majority in England as the Catholics are in Ireland," they occupied an inconsistent posi-

tion in dealing on right principles with the Roman Catholics of Ireland; and he did not know what answer the supporters of the Establishment in England could make to the Roman Catholics on this question. Lovers of truth and freedom, lovers of equality and justice as between conscience and conscience, were bound, both in matters of education and in matters of public policy, to throw their influence on the side of complete religious equality for all, and the prohibition of all from taking anything from the national resources to propagate their own sectarian views. (Applause.)

Mr. CHARLES MIALL, in rising to propose a vote of thanks to the lecturer, took occasion to refer to the debate and division which had taken place that afternoon in the House of Commons on the second reading of Mr. Morgan's Burials Bill, of which he had been a witness. Mr. Gladstone, he said, had been sent to "Coventry," and had come back again, and, thanks to Mr. Disraeli, he was now again at the head of a united Liberal party. The leader of the Opposition had come forward to help his opponent to rehabilitate that party. That afternoon 280 Liberals had gone into the lobby with nearly all the members of Her Majesty's Government in support of Mr. Osborne Morgan's bill. Mr. Disraeli had come forward as the champion of the Established Church, like the showman in the "Old Curiosity Shop," who patronised Little Nell, and continually assured her "Codlin's the friend, not Short; Short's very well as far as he goes, but the real friend is Codlin." (Laughter.) The result of the intervention of the political Codlin was not only a majority of 63 for the second reading of the Burials Bill, but that 47 more members supported the measure than ever voted for it before during the four sessions it had been before Parliament. (Hear.) They, as Nonconformists, would not by any means discourage Mr. Disraeli from appearing as the champion of "the venerable Established Church." The more he took that line, the more he would rally the Liberal party to the side of disestablishment; and the time might not be far distant when they would once more see 280 or more members of the House of Commons, on party grounds, go into the lobby in support of a bill for the liberation of religion from State patronage and control. (Applause.) The event of that day was a great encouragement for them to persevere till success crowned their efforts.

Mr. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS, in seconding the vote of thanks to Mr. Picton for his admirable lecture, observed that they had to thank Mr. Disraeli for the compliment he had paid them that afternoon when he referred to "the matchless organisation and incomparable energy of the Nonconformists." Those were the words made use of by the leader of the Opposition, but Mr. Disraeli ought to have allowed something for the excellence of their cause, and the irresistible growth of public opinion in behalf of perfect religious equality.

The vote of thanks was carried by acclamation, and briefly acknowledged by the Rev. J. A. PICTON, who, in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Glover for taking the chair, observed that the greater acknowledgments were due to that gentleman, inasmuch as he believed that some slight difference of opinion existed between himself and Mr. Glover on the relation of education to religious equality, and their worthy chairman would perhaps not quite agree with some of the sentiments expressed in the lecture.

The motion was seconded by Mr. FORSAITH, and carried with applause.

The CHAIRMAN, in expressing his acknowledgments, said he had listened to the lecture with a very great deal of pleasure. As to any difference of opinion between Mr. Picton and himself on the subject of education, he did not know that there was anything in the lecture with which he could not agree; but whether there was or not, he had been very glad to hear it. Such a masterly exposition of the bill which had been defeated must be very valuable to all who had the good fortune to be present to hear it.

The meeting then broke up.

A manuscript of eighty-four folios of the illustrious astronomer Copernicus has been found at Ermeland, in Prussia. The subject is not stated.

In view of Lord Lytton's burying-place, it is singular that, five times in the last four leaves of "Kenelm Chillingly" occur the words "Victory, or Westminster Abbey!"

The autobiography of Thomas Jackson, the Wesleyan patriarch, is to be published by the Methodist Book Room, who purchased the copyright some time ago for 400l.

A scientific expedition, appointed and paid by the Austrian Ministry of Education, and headed by the well-known archaeologist, Professor Conze, of the Vienna University, will start about the middle of April on a tour of archaeological and geological exploration in Samothracia.

The large collection of valuable works left by Turner, which have so long been the subject of a suit in Chancery, are being sold by Messrs. Christie, Manson, and Woods, at their rooms. Many of these works are of the highest interest, and some have never been published. There are 930 lots. The plates of the "Liber Studiorum," of which there were thirty-two complete sets of the seventy-one plates, realised 12,636l. 11s. 6d.

Published by ARTHUR MIALL, at No. 18, Boulevard Street, London; and Printed by ROBERT KINGSTON BURT, White Office Court, Fleet Street, London.—Wednesday, April 3, 1873.